DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 771 EA 013 003

AUTHOR Araki, Charles T.: And Others
TITLE A Study of the Secondary School Principalship in Hawaii.
INSTITUTION Indiana State Teachers Assoc., Indianapolis.
PUB DATE Dec 79
NOTE 102p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes: *Administrator Characteristics: *Administrator Qualifications: *Administrator Role: Curriculum Development: *Principals: Questionnaires: School Community Relationship: School Surveys: Secondary Education: State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Hawaii

ABSTRACT

This is the first of a projected series of three reports that present the results of a study of the secondary school principalship in Hawaii. The primary purpose of the study was to develop a profile of Hawaii's public high school principals by using field survey research techniques. The design was adapted from a nationwide survey of secondary school principals carried out under the auspices of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). A total of 15 secondary school principals were involved in the statewide survey, which used a questionnaire (included in the report) and interviews to gather data. The study results are organized into nine parts: general background and profile of the secondary principal: task- and job-related activities: the principal and the student: the principal and school community relations: the principal and staff perceptions: the principal and curriculum development: the principal and problem-solving: the principal as a change agent: and the personal, professional, and future aspects of the principalship. A summary of the results is included along with suggestions and a comparison of the results of this study with the NASSP study. (Author/IRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193771

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A STUDY OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP IN HAWAII

by

Dr. Charles T. Araki
Dr. Mitsuo Adachi
Dr. John A. Thompson
Dr. Daniel W. Tuttle
Dr. Sheldon S. Varney

Department of Educational Administration
College of Education
University of Hawaii

December 1979

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. A. Thompson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 013 003

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iii
I. Introduction and Background of the Study	1
II. Design and Methodology	3
III. Results of the Study	5
A. General Background and Profile of Hawaii's Secondary School Principals	5
B. Task and Job Related Activities of Hawaii's Secondary School Principals	8
C. Secondary School Principal and the Student	18
D. Secondary School Principal and School-Community Relations	23
E. Secondary School Principal and Perceptions of Staff	32
F. Secondary School Principal and Curriculum Development	38
G. Secondary School Principal and Problem Solving	42
H. Secondary School Principal As a Change Agent	44
I. Personal/Professional and Future Aspects of the Secondary School Principal	47
IV. Summary of the Results	54
V. Comparative Analysis of the Results	70
VI. Suggestions	75
APPENDIX 1	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Highest Degree Possessed by Hawaii's Secondary Principals	6
2	Average and Range for Time (Hours) Scheduled and Time (Hours) Spent on Administrative Tasks in a Two-Week Period	9
3	Principals' Ranking of How They Spent Their Time Among Nine Tasks	12
4	Principals' Rank of How They Believe They Should Spend Their Time Among the Nine Tasks	13
5	Frequency of Meetings Between Principal and Student Leaders by Number and Percent	19
6	Types of Student Leaders Principals Meet With At Least Once a Month by Number and Percent	21
7	Typical Content of Meetings Between Principals and Student Leaders by Number and Percent	22
8	Hawaii Secondary Principals' Contact with Community Groups During the Past Several Months	25
9	Extent of Community Participation In School Curriculum Planning	26
10	Type and Frequency of Hawaii Secondary Principals' Contact With Parental Groups	28
11	Recent "Main Concerns" of Parental Groups Which Have Met With Hawaii's Secondary Principals	29
12	Range of Subject-Matter Areas Covered as a Result of Hawaii Secondary Principals' Contact With Parents or Other Citizens	31
13	Methods Employed by Hawaii's Secondary Principals for Communicating Information About Schools to Parents and the Community	33
14	A Frequency Distribution of the Principal's Perception of the Importance of Various Teacher Issues/Concerns	34
15	Distribution of the Percentage of Principals by Sex in the National Sample in 1977 and the Hawaii Sample in 1978	70

I. Introduction and Background of the Study

This report is the first of a series of three projected reports which present the results of "A Study of the Secondary School Principalship in Hawaii," conducted by the members of the Department of Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Hawaii. The primary purpose of this study was to develop a profile of Hawaii's senior public high school principals by utilizing field survey research techniques.

The design for this study was adopted, but substantively modified, from a nationwide survey of secondary school principals carried out under the auspicies of the National Secondary School Principals Association. Two states, Hawaii and Alaska, were omitted from the NASSP study. Thus it appeared that this study would provide needed data for the interested parties within the state plus allowing those who wish an opportunity to compare responses about Hawaii's principals to the national study.

After the initial design of the study was completed, it was submitted to both the Personnel Services Branch of the Department of Education and the leadership of Unit 6, asking for their cooperation in allowing the study to be undertaken. On Monday, December 4, 1978, the Superintendent's Advisory Group, Department of Education, State of Hawaii, unanimously approved the study, and the Board of Directors, Unit 6 of the Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA) supported it.

The participating principals were requested to complete a questionnaire and were interviewed, in-depth, by a member of the Department of Educational Administration. Data were gathered from three other groups within or closely connected to the school and to the school principal via a questionnaire and an interview. These groups, called "significant

others," consisted of students, teachers, and community members.

The interviewing of a principal and the "significant others" required approximately two (2) school days and an evening. All interviews and analyses of data were completed by June 1, 1979.

Study results are organized in nine (9) parts as follows:

Part A - General Background and Profile of Hawaii's Secondary School Principal

Part B - Task and Job Related Activities of Hawaii's Secondary School Principal

Part C - Secondary School Principal and the Student

Part D - Secondary School Principal and School-Community Relations

Part E - Secondary School Principal and Perceptions of Staff

Part F - Secondary School Principal and Curriculum Development

Part G - Secondary School Principal and Problem Solving

Part H - Secondary School Principal as a Change Agent

Part I - Personal/Professional and Future Aspect of the Secondary School Principal

After all nine areas are discussed, an overall summary of the results is presented to highlight the salient findings of the study. Finally, a brief analysis of the major findings with concomitant suggestions is offered.

II. Design and Methodology

The population parameter was Hawaii's secondary public school principals who administer an attendance center which includes the 12th grade. There are thirty-seven (37) of them within the seven (7) administrative districts in the state. The sample of principals was drawn partially from a stratified random sample and partly from a completely random selection. The stratified portion was generated by asking five district superintendents to nominate two (2) principals and two superintendents to nominate one (1) according to specific criteria. The following shows the district, number of secondary schools with a 12th grade, and number of principals nominated.

District	Total Number of Secondary Schools with 12th Grade	Sample Size
Honolulu	6	2
Central	6	2
Leeward	5	2
Windward	4	1
Hawaii	8	2
Maui	6	2
Kauai	3	1
	37	12

From the group of twelve (12) nominated principals, a 40 percent sample or five (5) principals were selected using the table of random numbers. The random selection occurred by drawing from the twenty-five (25) remaining principals, another 40 percent sample of ten (10) principals using the table of random numbers. A total of fifteen (15) secondary school principals were involved in this statewide study.

In each of the fifteen schools, a sample of students, teachers, and community was also selected. Four students representing specific designated positions, i.e., president of student council, etc. were selected in every school. Likewise, teachers and some community people were

selected by position. A non-random selection method was chosen to assure the "significant others" would be responding from the same perspective.

Each principal and significant others were sent a questionnaire and a letter explaining their part in the study, and their cooperation was requested. The interview technique which was applied by the members of the department was semistructured. Each respondent knew the questions in advance, and the interviewee wrote the response to each at the time of the interview.

Due to the nature of the questions, the analysis was non-structured. The two major techniques employed were a frequency count of the respondents on certain questions and a descriptive analysis for the open-ended queries.

While the individual questions were not tested for significance, it is well to note that a sample of size, fifteen from the population of thirty-seven, falls beyond the ninety percent confidence interval. Thus, the reader can be fairly certain that the responses from the randomly selected principals will represent those of all the principals in the state.

The analysis follows the pattern of the questionnaire. The reader who is interested in the questions from which the analysis is derived will find the questionnaire included in Appendix 1.

III. Results of the Study

A. General Background and Profile of Hawaii's Secondary School Principals

Each of Hawaii's secondary school principals, on the average, bears the responsibility for the educational development of approximately 1,600 students. Of these students, 37.2 percent are involved in college preparatory work; 29.8 percent in general programs; 27.6 percent in vocational/business programs; and 5.4 percent in other program types. Among the junior and senior students, about 14 percent are involved in special programs such as work study, released-time arrangements, community service, and other activities that do not fit the categories above. Although student enrollment (268-2,540) and student program interests (10-70 percent concentration in college preparation programs) vary, the overall administrative task faced by Hawaii's principals is substantial and complex.

On the average, Hawaii's secondary principals have 2.8 (median: 2) administrative staff members to help them. The assisting administrative staff includes vice principals, deans, activity directors, etc. In addition, the average principal has 4 student counselors, 70 teachers, and a classified staff. Due to differing secondary school enrollments, the amount of administrative, counseling, and teaching support varies. For example, in a small school, the principal may have no assisting administrative staff members, 1 or 2 counselors, and about 14 teachers; whereas, in a larger school the principal may have up to 10 assisting administrative staff members, 6 or 7 counselors, and up to 113 teachers.

The preparation of those who serve as secondary principals in Hawaii is varied, not withstanding the finding that all are married and 80 percent are men. As may be noted in Table 1, 20 percent have earned doctorates,

Table 1

Highest Degree Possessed by Hawaii's

Secondary Principals*

Highest Degree	No. of Instances	Percent (%)
A.B./B.S.	4	26.7
B.Ed.	2	13.3
M.Ed.	4	26.7
M.A.	3	20.0
Ed.D.	2	13.3
Total	15	100.0

*Question Posed: "Degree possessed--list."

46.7 percent have received a master's degree, and 40.0 percent possess a bachelor's degree (usually with some additional training).

Most of this group of principals have added to their formal training by attending educational workshops. The average attendance, since January 1975, is 2.33 workshops. However, the range is from none for 26.7 percent up to 6 workshops for one principal.

As of early 1979, incumbent secondary principals had been, on the average, in their present schools for almost 6 years (mean - 5.9 years; median - 5.5 years). However, their total school administration experience averaged 13.5 years (median - 13.5 years), and their years of teaching experience averaged approximately 10 years (mean - 9.9 years; median - 10.5 years). In addition, although most had very limited non-education related work experience, the average of such additional experience was approximately 2 years.

Although possessing considerable formal training and years of experience in school administration and teaching, Hawaii's secondary principals had not been very active in informal college activities (mean - 1.7 activity items), and only a few received college honors (mean - 9.5 items cited) or non-educational awards (mean - 0.6 items cited). Such results coincide with the national data about secondary school principals.

Perhaps due to the press of daily business, these principals, although members of key professional organizations (mean - 4 organizations), are moderately or very active in only about half. Further, they view these memberships as only moderately useful or not very useful to them in relation to the administration of their schools.

Activity in community organizations is limited. On the average, secondary principals have participated in 4.2 (median - 2) specific

community activities since January 1975. Nevertheless, most are members of at least two community organizations (mean - 2.7 organizations) and "active" in one (mean - 1.8 organizations).

When asked about the adequacy of the help provided by their administrative staff members, 46.7 percent of the secondary school principals indicated that their help is usually adequate, and 46.7 percent said that their help is somewhat or completely inadequate. Reaction to a similar query about the help provided by department or area chairpersons was more positive. A majority (66.6 percent) indicated that this type of help was usually adequate, and an additional 6.7 percent said that it was completely adequate. This perception may be, in part, due to the finding that the principals also indicated that most of their department or area chairpersons have at least one period of released time (mean - 5.7 persons; median - 8 persons).

B. Task and Job Related Activities of Hawaii's Secondary School Principals

Principals were asked to indicate the number of hours they scheduled to work on nine task areas plus an unscheduled time block during the two-week period prior to the interviews. They were also asked to write down the time they actually spent on these same tasks. As one might anticipate, there was considerable variation among the principals both in time scheduled per task and in time actually spent. Table 2 gives the average and range for each task for both scheduled time and time actually spent.

Several comparisons can be made between the amount of time scheduled and spent by the principals on task areas. Less time than scheduled was actually spent on program development (1.0 hours) and personnel (3.4 hours). Student behavior took more than twice the average time

Table 2

Average and Range for Time (Hours) Scheduled and Time (Hours) Spent on Administrative Tasks in a Two-Week Period

Task	Average Hours Planned	Range	Average Hours Spent	Range
Program Development	9.4	2-20	8.4	2-20
Personnel	11.4	1-20	8.0	1-23
School Management	11.1	0-20	11.1	5-26
Student Activities	7.9	0-24	8.1	2-24
Student Behavior	4.1	0-11	9.5	2-25
Community	3.5	0-6	5.3	2-9
District Office	8.0	0-23	9.6	2-23
Professional Development	3.0	0-10	4.0	0-14
Planning	2.7	0-8	3.8	0-8
Unscheduled Time	9.4	2-27	11.7	3-27

Note these figures can be divided by two to find a rough average of a one-week period. Although it is possible that a principal may spend zero hours in one or more categories during a given week.

anticipated by principals. Working with the community took an average of two hours more per two-week period than was planned. Activities which involved district offices averaged 1.6 hours more than scheduled. Both professional development and planning had higher average time spent than budgeted, and more time was expended for unscheduled activities than for planned activities.

It would appear from the data that, on the average, principals were able to plan their time well, with a couple of major exceptions. The range between the time spent and the time planned for the various activities was wide. In later analysis, an attempt will be made to determine if there are certain variables which related to the time differences.

Since most principals indicated discrepancies between their planned time and the time actually spent, they were asked about the causes for these interruptions. Two major categories emerged: (1) Telephone calls from either parents (who refused to talk to anyone except the principal) or the district offices (nearly every principal mentioned this source of interruption), and (2) unscheduled conferences with teachers, students, and parents. The teacher conferences were usually on work-related problems, e.g., interpretation of school or district policies, student related problems, and interpersonal concerns. Student problems were largely disciplinary in nature. The parent conferences were unspecified.

The only other concern cited by several principals was the Individual Education Program (IEP) conferences. These appear to take considerable time for at least some principals.

The principals were asked what groups were of assistance in carrying out long-range planning when that task was undertaken. The three groups which the principals most often reported as giving "much assistance" were

(1) department chairpersons (80%), (2) their own administrative assistants (73%), and (3) teacher committees (53%). At the other end of the spectrum, the groups most often listed as giving "no assistance" were (1) state administrators (53%) and (2) state specialists (27%). It is interesting to note that students (87%), parents (80%) and district administrators (80%) were rated as giving "some assistance most often."

The principals were asked to rank the distribution of the time spent in each of nine descriptive task areas during the course of a year. The rationale for asking the question was to construct a uniform measurement of time utilization so that principals could be compared. The results of the rankings are displayed in Table 3. Three things are obvious: (1) that a great majority of principals see "school management" as their major task in terms of time spent, (2) that while there is some spread, most principals do not rank the "community" as a major task, and (3) that a heavy majority of principals see professional development as the least time consuming of the tasks listed.

The lack of agreement among the principals may be partially explained by variables such as differences in size of schools and number of assistants; however, the wide dispersion of rankings is somewhat unusual. Additional tests of the data will attempt to ascertain whether there are systematic differences by size, training, or other variables.

In addition, principals were requested to rank the way they feel they should spent their time on the same nine task areas. The results are presented in Table 4.

It appears that the principals would like to spend more time on program development and to a somewhat less marked degree on planning

Table 3

Principals' Ranking of How They Spent Their Time Among Nine Tasks

Task	Rank								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Program Development		2	1	4	3	3	1		
Personnel	2	2	5	2	2	1			
School Management	7	2	3	1					
Student Activities		4	1	1	1	4	3		
Student Behavior	2	2	1	1	1	2	2		2
Community	1		1	1	2	1	2	5	1
District Office		3	1	1	1	2	1	4	1
Professional Development	1		3				2	2	3
Planning	1	1	2	3	3	1	2	1	

Table 4

Principals' Rank of How They Believe They Should Spend Their Time Among the Nine Tasks

Task	Rank								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Program Development	1	7	2	1	2		1		
Personnel	2	2	3	2	3			2	
School Management	5		3	2	2	1		1	
Student Activities		2		4	3	2	2	1	
Student Behavior				2	2	1	2	2	5
Community		1			3	5	3	1	2
District Office	1				1	2	4	2	4
Professional Development			3		2	2	3	3	1
Planning	4	1	3		2	2		2	

activities. They would prefer to spend less time on student behavior and on "paper work," which is often considered synonymous with the district office.

The final point of analysis of these data was to look for individual discrepancies between what the principal is doing and what he would like to be doing. The difference between the two rank orders was determined and revealed considerable discrepancy in three task areas: (1) Program Development, where four principals indicated they should be spending more time than they presently are, showed an average rank change of 3.2 (2) Student Behavior, where seven principals indicated they should spend less time than they presently do, showed a rank difference average of 4.7, and (3) Professional Development, where six principals indicated a desire to spend more time than they presently do, showed an average rank change of 3.6. It should be noted that two principals indicated they were spending more time on professional development than they should. The other rank changes were random and in no case were there more than two principals who indicated need for change, either to more time or less time.

When asked what factors influenced the time distribution reflected in the previous question, some of the principals responded rather generally, stating that time distribution was determined by the "needs of the school" or of the students. However, others tended to be more specific and cited additional paper work created by district and/or state requests and priorities adopted in meetings with steering committees or other teacher groups. Others answered the question from the point of view of how work gets completed. The most frequently mentioned statement was the inability of the principal to assign activities because of the lack of personnel. Others suggested that the climate of the school dictated the distribution of time. The "squeaky-wheel" concept was specified in one way or another by

eight principals. They suggested that time distribution is related to problems or to people; factors over which they can exert little control. In the interviews the suggestion that the principals were often unable to control their own time came through clearly.

Studies of the activities of principals on the mainland tend to arrive at similar conclusions. A study done by researchers at the University of Chicago found that during the school day (although not necessarily the work day), the principal had interaction with other people, on an average of one every three and one-half minutes. While resources did not allow for a "shadowing" during this study, the observations of the researchers tend to support the mainland research findings.

The principals were asked about the frequency of being away from home on school business on the average and during the past week. Thirteen of the fifteen indicated that they do spend time on school affairs during the evening hours. Seven said they averaged two nights per week throughout the year, five said three, and one said four. When asked about the previous week, four principals each cited two, three, and four nights while two said five nights. The median was three nights during that week. This figure is the same as that reported in the national study. Thus in this respect the Hawaii group and their mainland counterparts agree that their work includes substantial night activities.

Thirteen of the fifteen principals said that athletic events were among the activities which occupied their evening activities. The next most common (11) item was student activities other than athletics (band, clubs, plays, etc.). The other was parent groups (ten principals said that either PTSA, Title I, booster groups or all of these). Another activity cited by several of the Neighbor Island principals was fund raising. It is obvious that the secondary principals' work day is not

concluded at the end of the school day. Their responsibilities extend into various out-of-school activities, as do those of their mainland counterparts.

Ten principals indicated that they used weekends to catch up on work they were unable to do during the week. They mentioned completing reports for the district office, planning the next week's activities, and writing memos. In addition, the supervision of athletic contests and of other student affairs was cited. Only one principal said he did not work nights or weekends; he "leaves his job at school and doesn't take it home with him."

For the great majority of the principals, their work time can be divided into three periods: (1) the school day, (2) evening activities, and (3) weekends. Period one seems characterized by some planned and many unplanned activities, period two by either supervisory activities or parent and community-related activities, and period three by "quiet-time" activities which are not conducive to interruptions.

Thirteen principals indicated that the things they plan are the primary determinates of what they will do on a given day. Beyond that, the rankings show little agreement with "things that just come up" or "weekly cycle of responsibilities," the secondary set of determinates.

Principals use either Friday afternoons or Monday mornings as their time to plan the next week's activities. They rely upon the master calendar as the chief planning aid and often make a written list of the things to be done.

Perhaps one of the most important questions which the survey team asked was a query to identify the "roadblocks" which make the principal's job more difficult than it should be. The priorities reported varied as much as the language used to describe them. An effort to categorize the

various statements resulted in the establishment of the following categories: (A) lack of administrative support, (B) staffing problems, (C) problems with the district or state educational organizations, (D) lack of managerial flexibility, (E) funding, (F) insufficient time to meet and plan with the staff, (G) a general category titled union problems, (H) paper work, (I) problems related to the student mix plus several other minor (in the sense that they were not often mentioned) categories.

In order of the number of times cited, as well as the relative ordering, the following results were obtained. Ten principals cited (A) lack of administrative support as a "roadblock." Nearly all ranked it as the highest priority. This included both professional and clerical support and was often expanded upon by both teachers and parents when they were interviewed.

The second group of "roadblocks," with five principals citing each, consisted of (C) problems relating to the district and the state educational officers and (G) union problems. Concerns about the district and state were often cast in terms either of complaints about short deadlines for responses to queries or the inability of the prircipal to get rapid and complete answers to questions put to the upper echelon administrator. Up-down communication was specifically listed by two principals. Union problems revolved around restraints on the ability to assign personnel.

The next group of concerns consisted of (B) staffing problems, (D) lack of managerial flexibility, and (F) lack of time to meet and plan with the staff. Of these, the highest rank ordering was lack of flexibility. The principals (four) who cited this problem felt that D.O.E. regulations, the contracts, and federal regulations were circumscribing their management prerogatives to a greater or lesser extent. Lack of time to meet and

plan with the staff may have contract implications as well. Staffing problems were either that certain teachers were unsuited to teaching or that they were teaching out of their area of training and certification. Also the transfer policies were seen to be at odds with the ability of the principal to staff his school at its optimum potential.

The next problem (H) paperwork may overlap with (C). Principals cited too many surveys and other information gathering papers, lack of organization, i.e., asking for the same or similar information more than once, and the complexity of federal regulation (IEP's for instance).

Problems with funding were usually not explained in detail, and the student mix (I) was specific to certain locales.

Another problem cited by principals in two Neighbor Island schools involved the issue of raising money in the community for the purpose of funding the activities program. This is a major burden on small communities. In effect it becomes a tax levied on the community and thus unfair in the sense that it is not proportional to wealth or any other rational criterion.

Other problems of geographic isolation, small staff and difficulty in scheduling the in-service needs of teachers are all substantial "roadblocks" for certain principals.

C. Secondary School Principal and the Student

Table 5 shows the frequency of meetings between the principal and the student leaders. The principals generally report having met monthly with the student leaders. Of the fifteen principals, six or 40 percent met monthly; four or 26.7 percent met weekly; three or 20 percent met when needed; one or 6.7 percent met twice weekly; and one or 6.7 percent none at all.

Table 5

Frequency of Meetings Between Principal and Student Leaders by Number and Percent

Frequency of Meeting	Number	Percent (%)
a. Daily	0	0.0
b. Twice Weekly	1	6.7
c. Weekly	4	26.7
d. Bi-Weekly	0	0.0
e. Monthly	6	40.0
f. Other (As Needed)	3	20.0
g. None	1	6.7
TOTAL	15	100.0

Table 6 reflects the types of student leaders principals met with at least once a month. The most frequently mentioned group was the class officers or student council, reflecting twelve or 80 percent of the total number of responses. The next most frequently mentioned group was the informal leaders, reflecting eight or 53.3 percent of the total responses. Special advisory groups and club leaders followed closely, reflecting 46.7 percent of the total responses. Cabinet members and others were cited by 26.7 percent and 6.7 percent, respectively.

Table 7 shows the typical content of meetings between principals and student leaders. The meetings seemed to focus on activities; fourteen of the fifteen sampled principals listed activities as the typical content of meetings with student leaders. Curriculum concerns was the next most frequently listed content of meetings, reflecting seven or 46.7 percent of the total responses. Following closely are school rules and student-teacher relations, reflecting 40 percent of the total responses. Teaching quality, student-student relations, student discipline, student-community problems, and others followed in that order.

The most frequently mentioned technique or method used by principals to influence student behavior in positive directions was the maintenance of close student contact with positive reinforcement of constructive student behavior or acts. Another frequently mentioned technique was taking the initiative to make student and parent contact.

The role that principals played in implementing these initiatives was one of direct involvement. Also frequently mentioned was the role that they played varied depending on the situation. Principals also actively engaged the student activities coordinators and counselors to assist in the implementation of the various initiatives they executed.

Table 6

Types of Student Leaders Principals Meet With At Least Once a Month by Number and Percent

Types of Student Leaders	Number	Percent (%)
a. Cabinet Members	4	26.7
b. Class Officers or Student Council	12	80.0
c. Special Advisory Groups	7	46.7
d. Informal Leaders	8	53.3
e. Club Leaders	7	46.7
f. Others	1	6.7

Table 7

Typical Content of Meetings Between Principals and Student Leaders by Number and Percent

Typical Content of Meeting	Number	Percent (%)
a. Activities	14	93.3
b. School Rules	6	40.0
c. Curriculum	7	46.7
d. Student-Teacher Relations	6	40.0
e. Student Discipline	4	26.7
f. Student Community Problems	4	26.7
g. Teaching Quality	5	33.3
h. Student-Student Relations	5	33.3
i. Others	2	13.3

The principals generally felt that the main school-connected concerns of their students were related to teacher quality and student-teacher relationships, followed closely by concern for the limited courses offered to meet their academic needs and achievement.

The principals felt that the main non-school concerns of the students were student-parent relationships, boy-girl relationships, and jobs after graduation.

The technique used most frequently by principals to keep informed on what the students think about school or life in general was to talk to students as they walk the campus. Making themselves available to students and participating in all activities were also mentioned as techniques.

Most principals viewed their primary roles with students as that of providing them the best possible educational program. Concomitantly, many principals felt that their role was basically to support students in their endeavors to obtain an education.

Most principals hoped to be perceived by students as persons who were fair and concerned about student development and welfare. Another most frequently mentioned desirable perception was that of a person who was supportive of the student's endeavors.

When asked what should be the school's major contributions to the lives of students, most principals responded with a basic theme that of "providing students with the best possible educational program and preparing students to be functional in society."

D. Secondary School Principal and School-Community Relations

Hawaii's secondary school principals appeared to keep in reasonably close touch with groups active within their communities. This is

illustrated by the data presented in Table 8. Less than 10 percent (6.7 percent) reported "no significant contact" with any community group. However, the contacts cited indicate that a substantial number view contact with other governmental agencies and parent groups as "community group agencies." Among non-governmental and non-parental groups contacted, community associations (46.7 percent) and Lions Clubs (Hawaii's largest and most active service group--26.6 percent) loomed as the most significant community liaison groups for principals. On the average (exclusively governmental and parental groups), principals were in touch with about 2.5 community groups or agencies.

The more frequent governmental contacts were with the Department of Health, the Department of Social Services and Housing, and the Police or the Family Court. Only 6.7 percent of the principals mentioned significant contact with the Hawaii State Legislature, a finding which seems to be contrary to the widespread assumption that there are frequent contacts between the legislators and the principals.

The nature of these community contacts varied. These contacts ranged from regular monthly meetings attended to the delivery of luncheon speeches. Many, if not most, appeared to be directly related to matters of school concern, e.g., solicitation of volunteer assistance, the search for support of school functions, planning community projects, traffic problems, and ambulance service.

When asked whether or not community persons or organizations participated in school curriculum planning, approximately one-half of Hawaii's secondary principals said that they did, while an equal proportion said that they did not. These data are portrayed in Table 9.

Table 8

Hawaii Secondary Principals' Contact With Community Groups During the Past Several Months*

Type of Organizational Contact	Contacts*	Percent (%)
Community Association	7	46.7
Business Association	2	13.3
Senior Citizens	2	13.3
Alu Like	3	20.0
Lions Club	4	26.7
Parent Group	2	13.3
Dept. of Social Services & Housing	3	20.0
Department of Health	4	26.7
Police/Family Court	3	20.0
Legislature	1	6.7
Other	16	106.7
None	1	6.7

*Question posed: "Over the past several months, with what community groups or agencies have you had significant contact?" (OPEN-END QUERY)

Table 9

Extent of Community Participation In

School Curriculum Planning*

Reaction	No. of Instances	Percent (%)
Yes	7	46.7
No	7	46.7
	14	93.4
No Reply	1	6.6
Total	15	100.0

*Question posed: "Do community persons or organizations participate in curriculum planning for your school?" (CHECK ONE)

However, it should be noted that even in the schools where community persons or groups participated in curriculum planning, the process appeared to be limited. In a small minority of instances where such participation appeared to be significant, the process appeared to stem from the newly formed individual school advisory council.

In general, community organizations or agencies did not appear to exert a great deal of influence on school matters other than curriculum. Judging by the responses of principals, what influence did exist came from community associations, general and special purpose service organizations, and other departments of government, e.g., the Health Department and the county Police. This type of influence appeared to stem from specialized community and/or governmental project interests. No principal indicated any general or specialized political influences or pressure.

As may be observed in Table 10, Hawaii's secondary principals maintained frequent and varied contact with a substantial range of parental groups. On the average, principals maintained contacts with more than 4.5 parental organizations. The frequency of such contacts ranged from three times per month to about one every four months.

Boosters clubs, PTA/parent organizations, Parent Advisory groups, and Vocational or Special Education Advisory groups were seen more regularly than other organizations presented as alternative response items to the principals. However, varied (other) groups, boosters clubs, and PTA Executive Committees appeared to be contacted more frequently during the period of a month. In general, as was noted earlier, Hawaii's secondary principals maintained very close contact with parent-oriented organizations.

Table 11 illustrates the wide range of "main concerns" of parents' groups which met with Hawaii's secondary principals during the past

Table 10

Type and Frequency of Hawaii Secondary Principals' Contact With Parental Groups*

Type of Organization	Number of Regular Meetings	Percent (%)	Approximate Average Frequency (Per Month)
PTA/Parent Organization	12	80.0	.52
PTA Executive Committee	9	60.0	.42
Parent Task Force	4	26.7	.67
Parent Advisory Group	10	66.7	.93
Boosters Club	13	86.7	1.00
Voc./Spec. Ed. Advisory	10	66.7	.34
Other	11	73.3	1.11
Mean of Means			0.78**

*Question posed: "With what parent groups do you meet regularly or frequently?" (CHECK WHERE APPLICABLE)

**Mean of means

Table 11

Recent "Main Concerns" of Parental Groups Which Have Met With Hawaii's Secondary Principals*

Main Concerns	Number of Instances	Percent (%)
Student discipline/behavior	6	40.0
Atheltics/bldgs. & facilities	6	40.0
Student safety	4	26.7
Fund raising	4	26.7
Career ed./planning	3	20.0
Curriculum	2	13.3
Student activities	2	13.3
Drug abuse	1	6.7
General parent survey	1	6.7
Student schedules	1	6.7
Too much homework	1	6.7
Traffic	1	6.7
Gifted/talented	1	6.7
Band trip	1	6.7
Parental participation in student affairs	1	6.7

*Question posed: "Over the past several months, what have been the main concerns of parents' groups with whom you have met?" (OPEN-END QUERY)

several months.

Student discipline/behavior, athletics and building (including other facilities) problems, student safety, and fund raising dominated the "main concerns" of parental groups when they met with Hawaii's secondary principals. Curriculum matters and student activities, coupled with a wide range of other parental problems, appeared to figure prominently in discussions with groups of parents.

In general, each principal appeared to have dealt with more than two major parental group "concerns" during the past several months.

Hawaii's secondary principals were confronted with a substantial variety of problem areas when both parent and other citizens were considered. This is shown in Table 12.

All of Hawaii's secondary principals were highly involved in finding and solving problems. Such would appear to be the nature of the position. However, two-thirds or more were also involved in contact with resource persons, evaluation, finance, and student rights and responsibilities. Other items listed in Table 12 also involved a substantial proportion of the principals.

On the average, each of Hawaii's principals were involved with approximately six of the nine contact areas listed, indicating that Hawaii's principals are well-involved with a wide range of subject matter contacts with parents and other citizens (considered together).

When asked if they had taken the initiative during the past three years to increase parent/citizen participation in school affairs, all (100.0 percent) of Hawaii's principals indicated that they had done this. Such activity encompassed a wide spectrum of contacts which ranged from parent and citizen advisory group meetings to very informal coffee hours

Table 12

Range of Subject-Matter Areas Covered as a Result of Hawaii Secondary Principals' Contact with Parents Or Other Citizens*

Subject Matter Area	Number of Instances	Percent (%)
Set objectives, priorities	7	46.7
Evaluation	10	66.7
Finance	10	66.7
Student rights & responsibilities	10	66.7
Resource persons	11	73.3
Aides	9	60.0
Curriculum advisory	6	40.0
Personnel criteria/selection	4	26.7
Problem finding or solution	15	100.0
Other	2	13.3

*Question posed: "In what areas have you involved parents or other citizens in the school?" (CHECK WHERE APPLICABLE)

and forums. The varied activities were designed to develop better school and community relations. This type of activity has been a major emphasis item on the agenda of the State Department of Education, and Hawaii's secondary principals indicated that they have been taking this particular facet of their positions very seriously.

In an effort to communicate information about school programs and organizations to parents and the community, Hawaii's secondary principals appeared to be utilizing many of the standard group methods of keeping in touch with their relevant clientele. This is readily observable by referring to Table 13.

Approximately three-fourths of Hawaii's secondary school principals communicated school information to parents and others via bulletins designed for parents (presumably via school distribution) and via mail to parents. About one-half of the principals utilized group meetings (with or without bulletins), and a sizable minority utilized news release, school periodicals, and radio. Some other techniques utilized may be viewed in Table 13. Only 6.7 percent indicated that no organized method was utilized.

The average school principal appears to have employed more than two of the communication methods cited in Table 13.

E. Secondary School Principal and Perceptions of Staff

This set of questions dealt with principals' perceptions about their staff's reactions to a variety of topics. First, the principals were asked to rate their views on the importance of a number of teacher concerns. Table 14 provides a breakdown of their replies.

Table 13

Methods Employed by Hawaii's Secondary Principals for Communicating Information About Schools to Parents and the Community*

Method	Number of Instances	Percent (%)
Parent bulletins	8	53.3
Parent group meetings (inc. PTSA)	7	46.7
News releases	4	26.7
School newspaper & other periodicals	4	26.7
Radio and related	4	26.7
Mail to parents	3	20.0
Posters	2	13.3
Registration flyers	1	6.7
Report cards	1	6.7
Pipeline	1	6.7
No organized method	1	6.7

*Question posed: "What methods do you employ for communicating school programs and school organization concerns to parents and the general community? (This is intended to exclude communication about specific students.)" (OPEN-END QUERY)

Table 14

A Frequency Distribution of the Principal's Perception of the Importance of Various Teacher Issues/Concerns

Issue	Most Sig.	Somewhat Sig.	Relatively Insig.	No Response
Salaries	1	7	5	2
Student Behavior	8	5	2	
Class Size	7	5	2	1
Insufficient Time	6	6	2	1
Lack of Public Support	4	3	6	2
Staff Evaluation		3	10	2
Lack of Clerical Help	4	4	5	2
Inadequate Instructional Material	3	5	5	2
Ineffective Administration		4	8	3
Student Grading	2	8	3	2

It must be recognized that results of the principals' perceptions regarding these issues are tempered by size of school, length of teacher service, as well as those things the principals see as important. By assigning a numerical quantity to the responses (3 = most significant, 2 = somewhat significant, 1 = relatively insignificant), it was possible to determine the most and least important issues, as the principal viewed them. The three most important items or issues, in order, were: student behavior, class size, and insufficient time to prepare and teach material. The least important issues were staff evaluation and ineffective administration, with lack of public support in the third position.

While the researchers did not ask the teachers in the sample precisely the same question, they were queried about the strengths and weaknesses of the school. Their answers stressed student behavior and the time necessary to do a good teaching job. None of the teachers mentioned evaluation or salary, although several reflected upon the administration of the school either positively or negatively. Thus the principals appeared to be quite accurate in their collective assessment of the teacher concerns.

The next question posed to the principals was related to school climate and the part the principal played in affecting morale/climate. The principals were more inclined to identify the elements of a good climate than they were to address their role in achieving it. Seven principals said that a good climate occurs when the students, teachers and administration work together and there are no splinter groups whose goals are not in agreement with those of the rest of the group. To achieve this state, several suggestions were made: (1) Provide clearly defined group-selected goals, (2) teachers and administrators have goals

and policies developed as a team, (3) teachers are provided effective and structured communication and allowed to evaluate the communication system, and (4) all teachers to clarify their roles.

Some principals had differing views on the principal's techniques for achieving good climate. For instance, two principals said this could be achieved by maintaining "distance" between principal and teachers, while another said one should be very open and humanitarian.

Others saw very tangible ways to improve climate such as painting the school in school colors, making the students feel safe in school, a good athletic program, and security guards.

It would appear that the principals have a desire to improve school climate, although the method of improvement varies among the several schools. This desire became abundantly clear to the members of the research team as they gathered their data.

The principals were asked about their efforts to promote staff development through in-service training. The largest number of responses was to have workshops brought to the school campus. Six principals reported that they did this during the year while three carried out this activity in the summer. All of the academic subject areas taught in secondary schools were named by at least one of the principals sampled, but reading and math were most frequently named. The second most popular technique was to have teachers attend workshops set up by others on the campus. The next most common technique was to establish an in-service committee of teachers and the administration. One could assume that this led either to sponsoring or to attending workshops as described above.

Several methods of providing time for in-service training were discussed. These included changing the bell schedule and having

"flex-time." Some principals carried out their own in-service programs by helping to develop language arts or math curriculums. Others made their teacher meetings in-service oriented by discussing academic or program matters. One principal did demonstration teaching.

The principals tended to believe additional in-service training was necessary, but they did not feel they had the authority to involve teachers in any other than in a voluntary manner. Time for in-service training was suggested as a major problem for several of the principals.

The principals were asked about the advantages and disadvantages of administering a school with a negotiated agreement.

The principals looked at the advantages in two ways: To the administrators and to the teachers. The advantages to the administrators cited were that a negotiated agreement makes for uniform treatment of teachers and that it spells out "clearly" the do's and don'ts, as several of the principals put it.

The disadvantages were those universally heard: The contract limits administrative flexibility in assigning duties and in giving rewards of one kind or another, and it protects the teacher who is not up to the standards (in the eyes of the principal) set for competent teaching. Some principals suggested that a contract tends to develop a "sameness" among the teachers, and there was some concern about teachers being able to transfer into a school without the principal being able to select teachers wanted by the principal. Two other collateral questions were asked: (1) How much is the principal involved in the negotiation process? On a scale of one to five, 55 percent of the principals indicated either 1 or 2, with one on the scale representing "no involvement," and two on the scale indicating "some involvement." Only 20% indicated a five which

represented a high level of involvement.

Principals were also asked to state their views on how they thought the teachers perceive them in regard to their position in negotiations. Sixty percent of the principals indicated they believe the teachers see them as somewhere between "somewhat" and "highly" supportive (at a 4 or 5 on the scale) of the issues being negotiated by the teachers.

The principals were asked to characterize the faculty's influence on the decision-making process in their high school. The principals rated the influence of the teachers as 4+ on the scale, a rating which would be just below "highly influential." When faculty in the schools were asked a similar question, they did not rate themselves that high. In other words, there is a lack of congruence between principals and teachers concerning the amount of influence teachers have in the decision-making process in the school.

F. Secondary School Principal and Curriculum Development

The analysis of the responses by the principals indicated that the curriculum development process is one in which the central office plays a major role. This heavy reliance on the central office may be attributed to the uniqueness of Hawaii's centralized state system. Program guides, in-service training support, direction setting, and final approval were listed as central office involvement. The principals also looked to the high school staff as a whole as well as to the various departments within the school for curriculum development. While the principals reported that departments occasionally originated and developed plans for curriculum development, the role of acting as a sounding board or reactor was the major service attributed to both the entire school faculty and the various

subject area departments. Departments were involved in developing guidelines for implementation of programs at the school level which would again seem to imply that departments tend to react to state initiated programs.

Principals also gave prominence to curriculum committees composed of department heads, students, community groups, and parents in the curriculum development process. Somewhat less prominent in the curriculum development process was the role played by consultants. Principals related to consultants from the central office more frequently than to University consultants.

The process which Hawaii's principals used in planning major projects and programs was perceived in various ways and no one major process was defined. Defining goals/objectives, organizing, and providing for resources received the most attention and was followed closely by establishing needs and providing for evaluation. Recognizing the occasion and providing for training followed, with securing allegiance the least important aspect of the process. Principals tended to use a combination of processes in planning specific major projects and programs, i.e., organizing and providing resources.

Providing leadership in various ways was the role that Hawaii's principals perceived they play in curriculum development. The leadership role in descending order follows: (1) initiator, (2) facilitator, (3) supporter, (4) evaluator, (5) advisor, (6) coordinator, (7) developer, (8) assessor, and (9) informer. The informer role was mainly that of keeping district and state program personnel informed of status/progress.

The professional resources which principals relied upon for curriculum/program improvement and which were mentioned most frequently were district

and state specialists, in-house resources (teachers), periodicals such as the Kappan (PDK), NASSP publications and Educational Leadership (ASCD), and university consultants. There seemed to be heavy reliance on teachers and fellow administrators as professional resources.

Hawaii's centralized system would appear to be very influential in initiating curricular changes. The state administration was most frequently cited by the principals as responsible for initiating curricular changes. The state administration was followed by subject matter departments, district administration, and building administration. The individual teachers, students and parents were cited harboring a lesser role.

According to the principals, the major strengths of their schools in descending order were: (1) good programs, (2) good faculty, (3) special programs, (4) good students, and (5) small pupil/teacher ratio. A wide variety of offerings for the college and non-college bound students was mentioned under good programs. The cooperative attitude and commitment of teachers added to the major strength of the schools. Guidance, alternative programs, and programs for the immigrants also give strength to the schools.

The major weaknesses as seen by the principals were more difficult to categorize. Mentioned most frequently, in descending order, were: (1) lack of special programs/electives, (2) mediocre teachers, (3) staff reduction, (4) poor facilities, (5) lack of overall state direction, (6) traditional approach to content/teaching, (7) student turnover, and (8) poor advisors for extra-curricular activities.

Lack of special programs/electives for the slow learner and the academically talented was a major concern of the principals. Electives

in the fine arts, music, and foreign languages seemed lacking according to the principals. Staff reduction caused teachers to teach outside of their teaching field, with attendent scheduling problems.

There seemed to be an inconsistency in the strengths and weaknesses as seen by the principals in that good programs and lack of programs, good teachers and mediocre teachers were given high consideration for both categories. However, further analysis of the data indicated that the lack of programs in special areas and the good teacher factors far out-numbered the mediocre teacher factor.

The principals mentioned a variety of sources when asked how they anticipated curriculum needs and organized resources to meet these needs. Most frequently cited activities were (1) survey of student needs/interest, (2) discussion with department heads, (3) registrars, (4) counselors, and (5) test scores. New graduation requirement mandates were also given consideration by principals. A few principals reviewed goals and objectives and assessed teacher talents yearly.

The principals' self-evaluation of their effectiveness in the area of curriculum development on a five-point scale, with 1.0 ineffective and 5.0 highly effective, had a range of 3.0 to 5.0, with the median at 4.0. Only two principals of the 15 placed themselves as highly effective in curriculum development. There was much reliance on the department heads for curriculum development by the principals. The lack of time or time that must be given to other concerns in the schools was frequently mentioned as a barrier for being more effective in curriculum development.

Hawaii's principals were deeply involved in extra-curricular activities. Such involvement was not only attendance or monitoring of activities and functions, but in providing the leadership to initiate and seek

financial support for many of the extra-curricular activities. Such involvement was necessary, as one principal indicated, because of less teacher participation in this area than has been the situation in the past.

G. Secondary School Principal and Problem Solving

One of the questions asked of the principals was "Can you name a problem that happened since September, 1978, that you feel you handled well?" An analysis of the problems cited by the principals reveals that fourteen of the fifteen problems dealt with people. The problem which did not deal directly with people was that of selecting an athletic field site.

A careful analysis of the problem solving process used by the principals showed the lack of a formal process. There appeared to be no evidence of the use of either the scientific or reflective thinking methods. The process tended to be unilateral and solution oriented, encompassing only problem identification and solution seeking.

A majority of the principals tended to identify the problem and directly seek alternative solutions by themselves. Most principals reported that they then consulted with subordinates or others involved with the problem concerning the selection of the best alternative before determining the final solution themselves. This consultative mode of leadership seemed to be the practice of the majority.

The analysis also revealed that the major focus of the problem solving process was to convince the people involved, primarily through meetings called by the principal, that the alternative favored by the principal was the best.

The analysis generally showed that the problem solving method used by the principals was intuitive. The final solution selected or decision made seemed to be one of compromise between parties involved, and the principals played the role of compromiser and referee.

Another question asked was "Can you name a problem that happened since September, 1978, that you feel you did not handle well?" The problems presented by the principals varied in type. Although a majority dealt with people, more problems dealing with environmental factors and external situations emerged in response to this question than to the "problem handled well" question.

An analysis of the problem "not handled well" indicates that the failure was attributed to the lack of either preparation and planning or criteria and procedures. Moreover, the problems identified were symptoms of more basic problems dealing with environmental factors and external situations. Again, the principals tended to be solution-minded and to act hastily without going through a formal problem solving process.

When asked how effective they regarded themselves in problem solving, fourteen of the fifteen sampled principals rated themselves 4 or 5, which is "highly effective," on an ascending 1 to 5 scale. One principal rated himself 3, or "somewhat effective."

The most important components of the problem solving process, as perceived by the principals, were clear definition and understanding of the problem, objectivity and rationality of the people involved, fact finding, and the ability to communicate with people.

When asked how they determined when a decision should be made, the response most frequently offered by the principals was that it was "intuitive." The emphasis was on "gut feeling." Another response often given was "after the facts are in."

Another area addressed in the study of the problem solving process used by the principals was the actions taken in response to change imposed upon the schools. The most frequently mentioned sources of "change-imposition" were the state and district levels. The most frequently mentioned specific "change-imposition" was that of graduation requirements. The actions taken by most principals in response to imposed changes were soliciting the support of the staff to carry out the requirements and involving staff in planning the implementation of the mandated programs. The principals' general responses were compliance and doing the best job possible. Only one principal mentioned non-compliance as a response. However, the addition of an internal policy satisfied the mandate.

H. Secondary School Principal As a Change Agent

The principals' perception of changes which take place in their schools and their own and other peoples' role in these changes were also explained in this study. The type of change, the source of resistance to change, the change roles of various persons, and the change process were the focus of this portion of the study.

Of the 15 principals interviewed, two said no changes took place in their schools. Thirteen principals identified the following changes:

Types of Changes	Frequency	Percent (%)
Curriculum Program Changes	8	53.3
Curriculum Procedural Changes	6	40.0
Total Curriculum Change	14	93.3
Professional Personnel Actions	2	13.3
Professional Personnel Programs	3	20.0
Total Professional Personnel Changes	5	33.3
Student Personnel Procedural Changes	5	33.3

These findings indicated that most of the identified major changes were in the curriculum area, with changes in English courses and topics generally referred to as "back to basics" making up the majority of the curricula program changes. The personnel program changes were in the area of in-service training for staff, and the student personnel procedural changes were in the area of such things as attendance, discipline, parking, bell schedule and field trip procedures.

The initiator or initiators of change as identified by the principals were as follows:

Position	Frequency	Percent (%)
Principal	9	60.0
Central Administration	6	40.0
Staff	4	26.7
Others	3	20.0
Students	2	13.3
Advisory Group	2	13.3
Patrons	1	6.7

Principals see themselves as the major initiators of change in their schools. The principals perceived the non-school personnel categories of others, patrons and advisory groups as accounting for fewer than one quarter of all ideas for change in the schools. Principals perceived that students accounted for only about 13 percent of the total number of ideas for change in the schools surveyed.

When asked "What is your typical role in the changes that occur in the high school?" the responses of the principals were as follows:

Role	Frequency	Percent (%)
Facilitator	14	93.3
Initiator	13	86.7
Planner	10	66.7
Evaluator	9	60.0
Consultant	9	60.0
Other	2	13.3

The broad response of principals as seeing themselves involved in change agent roles would appear to indicate that their perception of their role and responsibility in change is a major one. All but one principal saw their role as that of facilitator, and all but two principals saw their role as initiator. That over one-third of the principals perceived consulting, planning and evaluating change was not part of their role should also be noted.

When asked, "Do you have a particular strategy or approach--to bring about change?", all but one principal answered in the affirmative. The strategy or approach listed varied greatly from person to person, but nearly all cited the need to work with people. Some principals stressed working with all people and seeking involvement and commitment on the part of the total staff while a near equal number of principals stressed talking with "key" persons, identifying majority positions and reaching consensus. The major distinction between principals who regarded "people processes" as a key concept in bringing about change related to (1) whether they preferred to hold discussions with the total staff early in the process or (2) whether they preferred to isolate "key persons" to whom they would reveal the ideas for change, then try out the ideas for change and later try out the idea on the total staff.

A second major area of agreement concerning change strategy was from the few persons who cited the use of a type of scientific/rational problem-solving approach to change. A series of steps involving problem analysis, and the generation and analyses of alternatives could be attributed to seven of the fifteen principals in the study. Many of these same principals recognized the equal importance of people involvement strategies. Thus, it was impossible to separate the principals into

people-based or process-based change strategy groups.

I. Personal/Professional and Future Aspects of the Secondary School Principal

All principals were asked to state why they thought they were selected for the job they currently held. A summary of their open-ended responses is as follows:

1.	Most qualified for the job	6
2.	Right person for the situation	6
3.	Prior service as teacher or V.P. in that school	4
4.	School had problem/needed problem solver	3
5.	Past performance	3
6.	Minority person (ethnic, woman, etc.)	1
7.	Curriculum leader	1
8.	Attitude	1

It is somewhat difficult to identify mutually exclusive categories for open-ended responses. For example, does "most qualified" differ from "past performance?" From the above responses, it seemed that most principals felt that their personal or professional qualifications led to their getting the job. It would be an unusual person who would publicly identify socio/political reasons over competence reasons for being selected for an important job such as principal of a high school.

Most principals stated that they intended to remain on the job five years or under unless asked to stay longer by those in authority. One person indicated a desire to stay as long as the district permitted, while a majority of nine cited from one to five years as the most desirable length of tenure on the current job. One humorous principal appended that his intended length of tenure was to be . . . "or until my first ulcer!"

The most common strength listed by principals was the ability to work with people. Communication and problem solving skills were next, and experience and the ability to cope with stressful situations were the only

other types of strengths to be mentioned more than once. Other strengths cited were team building, common sense, fairness, goal setting, holding the correct values, organizational skills, perseverance, being innovative, and hard working.

When discussing their limitations, principals in this study showed an almost total absence of similarity. The lack of administrative assistants in the school and the lack of curriculum knowledge were the only areas mentioned by more than one principal. An additional finding was that, with the exception of communication, no item listed as a strength was perceived to be a limitation. For example, failure to budget time, lack of writing skills, lack of community involvement, health, lack of energy, failure to delegate, lack of personnel and fiscal resources, and several other traits were all listed as personal limitations. However, the converse of these traits was not listed as strengths. One principal cited communication as both a strength and a limitation.

The principals were questioned about the types of things that "get to you" as a principal. Of the fifteen principals responding, more than two out of every three reported some aspect of teacher behavior, from apathy to non-professionalism as "getting to them." Apathetic students and parents and "red-tape" were mentioned by two principals. Unnecessary paper work and excessively short deadlines for the paper work were the next most frequently mentioned stresses.

There was also much agreement among principals with regard to how they handled stress. Three-quarters of the principals mentioned some type of physical activity as a way of getting away from stress. Of the physical activities, fishing, golfing, and jogging were the most popular methods of removing stress, and of the persons listing this type of physical

activity, some other type of non-physical activity such as listening to stereo, talk with friends, have a few beers or write poetry were included as a balancing activity.

The most frequent type of job constraint mentioned by the principals in this study were both societal and institutional constraints on their autonomy. Federal rulings concerning student rights, equal opportunity, ERA and Title IX, state and district directives and "red tape," and union restrictions on meeting times with teachers were mentioned a total of sixteen times. The lack of resources in the form of personnel, facilities and money was the next most frequently mentioned constraint to the principal's job.

When asked with whom they could helpfully share problems, the principals responded as follows:

Other E.O.'s	10
Spouse	7
Close friends	6
Staff	3
Secretary	1
Shared with no one	2

The other educational officers mentioned ranged from their own vice principal to other principals to district level administrators. Both male and female principals mentioned sharing school problems with their spouses, while two principals mentioned that they shared their problems with no one.

Two-thirds of the principals felt that more administrative help was needed to make their job more manageable. Related to this was the request to reduce "paper work." An additional factor to increased manageability was the freedom to select and deploy their own personnel. The lowering of school size and having more decision making power at the school level were also requested. Another suggestion was that requests "should come

from school to District and State."

There were selection process, training process, and skill training suggestions made for the improvement of the in-service training of school level administrators. Suggestions were made that selection be based on: 1) interpersonal relations skills, 2) persons who won't surrender to personal ambition, 3) persons who won't surrender to the good of the DOE bureaucracy, 4) persons who bring values from their home. One suggestion was made that training should be based on individualized assessment of the candidates' needs.

Although some background course work was suggested as a method of pre-service training, most of the suggestions centered around internships or intern related activities.

Longer internship or on-the-job training (OJT) was suggested. In addition, it was suggested that interns get together as a group while in training to discuss situational problems, cases, and solutions. Observation and interview of more than one principal was also suggested.

The skills suggested to be included in a pre-service training program were as follws:

1. Communication
2. Coping
3. Interpersonal Competence
4. School Budgeting
5. Expenditure Plans
6. Financial Reporting
7. Curriculum Planning
8. Transportation Management
9. Community Involvement
10. Teacher Evaluation
11. Negotiation (skills) for Working with Department Chairpersons

Two principals suggested that the EMTP as presently in operation was adequate.

The in-service training suggestions presented a slightly different picture in that there was very little agreement with regard to the needs for in-service training. There was concern about being away from school for training, so substitutes for the principal or summer training programs were recommended. The following range of training processes were recommended:

1. Intervisitation
2. Accreditation visits
3. Attendance at national conferences
4. Professional improvement leaves
5. Conduct complex principals' problem-solving groups
6. Interprofessional seminars between principals, lawyers, engineers, public administrators, etc.

It was suggested that course content needs could be assessed by surveying the principals themselves. An additional suggestion advanced was that the principals themselves could "create" the workshops. There was also the suggestion that the in-service training program fit an integrated long-term pattern rather than be a series of "piecemeal" workshops. The specific content for recommended in-service training was as follows:

1. Budgeting
2. Management techniques
3. Mental health activities (golf, bowling, gardening for morale)
4. Curriculum
5. Politics for principals
6. Planning
7. Time utilization
8. Personal development activities (e.g., Positive Self Concept)
9. I.P.O. training
10. School law
11. Araki's workshops
12. Adachi's workshops
13. Awareness training

The principalship was considered by all but two principals as being an opportunity to exert leadership. The other two principals felt that the

job offered a moderate opportunity for leadership. Their reasons for feeling that the job presented opportunities for leadership varied widely. Several said the job was so big that there were many opportunities for leadership if they possessed the necessary skills. There was also some concern that many constraints from outside the school such as federal, state, district directives were detracting from the opportunities for leadership. Specifically, curriculum assessment, student welfare, affecting change, problem solving, working with people, student accomplishments were all areas in which leadership opportunities were possible.

The following suggestions for improving leadership opportunities were offered:

1. Remove custodial tasks
2. Remove legislative pressures on principals
3. Place resource allocation powers at school level
4. Provide additional personnel and resources at school level
5. Move more decision making to school level
6. Reduce paper work and provide time to get out of office and into school and classroom
7. Add flexibility and autonomy to principal's role
8. Have district set more specific outcomes for principals
9. Have district personnel act as staff to schools

The most commonly mentioned technique used to assess the pulse of the community was personal contact with community members, with more than one-half of the respondents citing this method. When combined with similar techniques such as "attend community functions," "live in the community," and "be part of the community and be open," nearly all principals utilized some form of direct contact with community members. Assessment of the community through advisory council and PTSA meetings was used by more than one-third of all principals. In addition, such techniques as discussion with students, staff members and formal opinion surveys and reading, listening to the media were also used.

A majority of the principals felt that the media had only a slight role in affecting their schools, while only one-fifth of all principals felt that the media played a large role. One-third of all principals mentioned that the media had a negative affect on their school, while only one of the fifteen mentioned that media had a positive potential. One principal mentioned the effect that media had on student life styles such as speech, dance, dress, and general appearance, while another cited that negative stories in the media frightened parents into sending their children to private schools. It was mentioned that media could be used as a positive force, but that to do so the principal had to act rather than react in potential media situations.

IV. Summary of the Results

This section discusses the salient data revealed by the survey and interviews of the secondary school principals.

Hawaii's secondary public school principals are all married and approximately 80 percent are men. A majority of Hawaii's secondary school principals are highly educated with 60 percent of the principals having obtained advanced degrees beyond the bachelors degree. Of the 60 percent of the principals possessing advanced degrees, 77.8 percent have a master's degree and 22.1 percent have a doctorate.

Hawaii's secondary public school principals show, on the average, school administrative experience of 13.5 years, with an additional 9.9 years of teaching experience.

Although the secondary school principals possess considerable formal training and administrative/teaching experiences, they were not very active in college activities and honors programs. This finding coincides well with the national study of secondary school principals executed in 1977.

Hawaii's secondary principals are active in professional and community organizations. On the average, the secondary principals have participated in 4.2 specific professional activities since January 1975, and belong, on the average, to 2.7 community organizations.

Hawaii's secondary school principals showed an equal split in their perceptions of the adequacy of the amount of help provided by their administrative staff. Exactly 46.7 percent indicated that their help was somewhat or completely adequate while an equal proportion, 46.7 percent, stated that their help was somewhat or completely inadequate.

Student behavior took more than twice the average time planned for it by principals. Other tasks which took more time than that budgeted were: Working with the community, district office activities, professional development and planning. The reasons given by principals for the foregoing activities taking more time than budgeted fall into two major categories: (1) Telephone calls from either parents or district officers and (2) unscheduled conferences with teachers, students, and parents. The other concern of interruption by several principals was the IEP (Special Education) conferences.

In carrying out long-range planning, principals stated that they had "much assistance" from department chairpersons (80%), their own administrative assistants (73%) and teacher committees (53%). Students (87%), parents and district administrators (80%) were rated as giving "some assistance most often;" whereas, state administrators (53%) and state specialists (27%) were rated as giving "no assistance."

The principals were asked to rank the distribution of the time spent in each of nine descriptive task areas over the course of a year. A great majority of the principals saw "school management" as their major task in terms of time spent, with professional development as the least time consuming of the tasks listed.

In addition, principals were requested to rank the way they felt they should spend their time on the same nine tasks. It appears that principals would like to spend more of their time on school management, planning and program development. Principals also prefer to spend less time on student behavior and on "paper work," which is often considered synonymous with district office matters.

When asked what factors influenced the time distribution reflected above, the principals cited district and/or state requests which created additional paper work, and priorities which were adopted in meetings--with steering committees or other teacher groups. The most frequently mentioned statement was the inability of the principal to assign activities because of the lack of personnel. It was also noted that time distribution was related to general school problems or people, in essence factors over which principals can exert little control. During the interviews, the suggestion that the principal was often unable to control his own time came through clearly.

When queried on the frequency of being away from home on school business, thirteen of the fifteen principals indicated that they spend time on school affairs during the evening hours. Seven said they averaged two nights per week throughout the year, five said three, and one said four.

When principals were asked about the previous week, four each responded to two, three, and four nights, while two said five nights. The median was three nights during that week. This figure is similar to the one reported by mainland principals whose work includes substantial night activities.

Thirteen of the fifteen principals said that athletics was among the activities which comprised the night activities. Another activity cited regularly by Neighbor Island principals was fund raising.

Ten principals indicated that they used weekends to catch up on work they were unable to do during the week. Principals used either Friday afternoons or Monday mornings as their time to plan the next week's activities. They used the master calendar as the chief planning aid and often

made a written list of the things to be done.

One of the most crucial questions which the survey team asked of the principals was to identify the "roadblocks" which make their job more difficult than it should be. Ten of the fifteen principals cited "lack of administrative support" as a "roadblock." Nearly all principals ranked it as the highest priority. However, this response included lack of professional and clerical support. Five principals cited problems relating to both the district and state offices and union problems as "roadblocks." The district and state officers were often cast as culprits for imposing unreasonably short deadlines for responses to queries and for the inability to get rapid and complete answers to questions asked of them. Union problems revolved around restraints on the ability to assign personnel.

The next group of concerns involved staffing problems, lack of managerial flexibility, and lack of time to meet and plan with the staff. Of these, the highest rank ordering was the lack of flexibility. Four principals citing this problem felt that the DOE regulations, the contracts, and federal regulations were circumscribing their management prerogatives to a greater or lesser extent.

Lack of time to meet and plan with the staff may have contract implications as well. Staffing problems related to teachers teaching out of their area of training/certification. In addition, transfer policies were seen by the principals to be at odds with their ability to staff their school to its optimum potential.

Principals also cited too many surveys and paper work; lack of organization, i.e., asking for the same or similar information more than once; and the complexity of federal regulations (IEP's, for instance).

Another problem cited by principals in two Neighbor Island schools had to do with the issue of raising money in the community for the purpose of funding the activities program. This seems to be a major burden on small communities. In effect, it becomes a tax levied on the community. Other problems of geographic isolation, small staff and difficulty in scheduling the in-service training of teachers are all "roadblocks" for certain principals.

Principals generally reported being in close contact with student leaders by meeting monthly and weekly. The student groups with whom the principals most frequently meet are the class officers and student council. Meetings generally focused on school activities with curriculum, school rules, and student-teacher relations following closely.

The most frequently mentioned technique used by principals to influence student behavior in positive directions was the maintenance of closer student contact with positive reinforcement of constructive student behavior. Another frequently mentioned technique was taking the initiative to make student and parent contact.

The technique used most frequently by principals to keep informed on what the students think about school or life in general was to talk with students as they walked the campus. Making themselves available to students and participating in all activities were also mentioned as techniques. Most principals hoped to be perceived by students as "fair persons" who are concerned with, and supportive of their development and welfare.

Hawaii's secondary principals appear to keep in reasonably close touch with groups active within their communities. Only 6.7 percent of the principals reported "no significant contact" with any community group.

Among non-governmental groups contacted, community association (46.7 percent) and Lions Club (26.6 percent) seemed to be the most frequently mentioned. The governmental agencies more frequently contacted are the Department of Health, the Department of Social Services and Housing, the Police Department, and the Family Court. Only 6.7 percent of the principals mentioned significant contact with the Hawaii State Legislature which is contrary to the widespread assumption that there is frequent contact between legislators and principals.

When asked whether or not community persons or organizations participated in school curriculum planning, approximately one-half of the principals (46.7%) said that they did while an equal proportion said that they did not. However, it should be noted that even in the schools where community groups participated in curriculum planning, the process appears to be limited in depth. In the small minority of instances where the participation appears significant, the newly formed individual school advisory council seems to be the point of contact.

In general, community organizations or agencies do not appear to exert a great deal of influence on school matters other than curriculum. What influence does exist comes from community associations, general and special purpose service organizations and other departments of government which may have community or governmental project interests in the school. No principal indicated any general or specialized political influence or pressure.

On the average, principals responded that they maintain contact with more than 4.5 parental organizations. The frequency of such contacts range from three times per month to about one every four months. Booster clubs, PTA/parent organizations, Parent Advisory Groups and Vocational

or Special Education Advisory groups are seen more regularly than other organizations.

Student discipline/behavior, athletics and building (including other facilities) problems, student safety and fund raising appear to be the "main concerns" of parental groups when they meet with principals. Curriculum matters and student activities appear to be a concern also of the parent groups when meeting with the principal.

With regard to the range of subject matter areas covered as a result of principals' contact with parents or other citizens, all principals said that they are involved in "finding and solving problems." Two-thirds or more are also involved in contacts with resource persons, evaluation, finance, and student rights and responsibilities. In general, Hawaii secondary school principals are involved with a wide range of subject matter contacts with parents and other citizens.

When asked if they had taken initiatives during the past three years to increase parent/citizen participation in school affairs, all (100%) of the principals indicated that they had done this. Since this type of activity has been a major emphasis of the DOE, the secondary principals indicated that they had taken this particular facet of their positions very seriously.

With regard to communicating information about school programs and organizations to parents and community, approximately three-fourths of the secondary principals reported that they communicate with parents and others via bulletins, designed for parents (school distribution), and via mail to parents. About one-half of the principals utilize group meetings, and a sizable minority utilize news releases, school periodicals, and

radio. In general, principals appear to utilize more than two of the methods available in communicating information about schools to parents.

When the principals were asked what seemed to be the issues/problems most important to the teachers in school, the three most important items cited, in order, were: (1) student behavior, (2) class size and (3) insufficient time to prepare and teach materials. The least important were staff evaluation and ineffective administration, with lack of public support in the third position. The principals appear quite accurate in their collective assessment of the concerns of teachers when the actual teacher's concerns were compared with the principal's list.

With regard to school climate, seven principals said a positive climate occurs when the students, teachers and administration work together and when there are no splinter groups whose goals are not in agreement with those of the rest of the group. To achieve this, several suggestions were made: (1) clearly defined group selected goals, (2) teachers and administrators have goals and policies evolved as a team, (3) give teachers effective structural communication to receive and evaluate communication as well, and (4) clarify the roles of the teacher.

The principals were asked about their efforts to promote staff development through in-service training. The most frequently mentioned response was to have workshops brought to the campus. The second most popular technique was to have teachers attend workshops set up by others on the campus. The next most common technique was to establish an in-service committee of teachers and the administration.

Several methods of providing the necessary time for in-service activities were discussed and included changing the bell schedule, having flex-time, etc. The principals believe additional in-service activities

are necessary and important, but they do not feel they have the authority to involve teachers in any other than a voluntary manner. Time for in-service training appears to be a problem for several of the principals.

When the principals were asked about the advantages and disadvantages of administering a school with a negotiated agreement, they looked at the advantages in the following ways: Makes for uniform treatment of teachers and spells out "clearly" the do's and don'ts. The disadvantages were: The contract limits administrator flexibility in assigning duties and in giving rewards of one kind or another and protects the teacher who is not up to standards (in the eyes of the principal). Some principals suggested that a contract limits their prerogative to select the teachers that they want.

When principals were asked to state their views on how they thought teachers perceive them with regard to their position in the negotiation process, 60 percent of the principals indicated they believed the teachers see them as highly supportive. Similarly, when the principals were asked to characterize the faculties' influence on the decision making process in their high school, they rated the influence as high. However, when faculty in the schools were asked a similar question, they rated themselves as being much less influential.

The analysis of the responses by the 15 principals indicated that the curriculum development process is one in which the central office plays a major role. This heavy reliance on the central office may be attributed to the influence of Hawaii's centralized state system.

The process which Hawaii's principals used in planning major projects and programs is perceived in various ways, and no one major process is defined. Defining goals/objectives, organizing, and providing for

resources received most attention and were followed closely by establishing needs and providing for evaluation.

The professional resources which principals rely upon for curriculum/program improvement and which were mentioned most frequently were district and state specialists, in-house resources (teachers), periodicals such as the Kappan (PDK), NASSP publications and Educational Leadership (ASCD), and university consultants. There seems to be a heavy reliance on teachers and fellow administrators as professional resources.

The state administration was most frequently mentioned by the principals in initiating curricular changes. The state administration was followed by departments within the individual school, district administration, and building administration.

According to the principals, the major strengths of their schools, in descending order, are: (1) good programs, (2) good faculty, (3) special programs, (4) good students, and (5) small pupil/teacher ratio.

The major weaknesses as seen by the principals are more difficult to categorize. Mentioned most frequently in descending order were: (1) lack of special programs/electives, (2) mediocre teachers, (3) staff reduction, (4) poor advisors for extra-curricular activities.

The principals mentioned a variety of sources when asked how they anticipated curriculum needs and organized resources to meet these needs. The most frequently cited activities are survey of student needs/interests, discussion with department heads, registrar, and counselors, and examining test scores.

Hawaii's secondary principals appear to be deeply involved in extra-curricular activities. The principals provide leadership to initiate and seek financial support for many of the extra-curricular activities.

A careful analysis of the problem-solving process used by the principals shows a lack of formal process. There is no evidence of the use of any scientific method or problem-solving process. The process tends to be unilateral and solution oriented, encompassing only problem identification and solution seeking. A majority of the principals tends to identify the problem and directly to seek alternative solutions by themselves. Most principals then consult with subordinates or others involved with the problem on the selection of the best alternative before selecting the final solution themselves. This consultative mode of leadership seems to be the practice of the majority of principals.

Analysis also reveals that the major focus of the problem solving process is to convince people involved, primarily through meetings called by the principal, that the alternative favored by the principal is the best and involves the least negative consequence. Analysis further shows that the problem solving method used by the sampled principals was "intuitive." The final solution selected or decision made seems to be one of compromise between parties involved, and the principals play the role of compromiser and referee.

The most important components of the problem-solving process, as perceived by the principals, are a clear definition and understanding of the problem, objectivity and rationality of the people involved, fact finding, and the ability to communicate with people.

When asked how they determined when a decision should be made, the response most frequently offered by the principals was that it was "intuitive." The emphasis was on "gut feelings." Another response often given was "after the facts are in."

Another area addressed in the study of the problem-solving process was the actions taken in response to change imposed upon the schools. The most frequently mentioned sources of change imposition were the state and district levels. The most frequently mentioned change imposition was the graduation requirements. The actions taken by most principals in response to improved changes were soliciting the support of the staff to carry out the requirements and involving the staff in planning the implementation of the mandated programs.

In the final section of the study, the principals' perception of changes which take place in their schools and their own and other people's role in these changes is discussed. Of the 15 principals interviewed, two said no changes took place in their schools. Thirteen principals identified changes taking place in curriculum, staff personnel and student personnel areas. The findings show that 53.3 percent of the identified major changes are in the curriculum area, with changes in English courses and topics generally referred to as "back to basics" making up the majority of the curricular program changes.

Principals see themselves as the major initiators of change in their schools. All but one principal perceive their role as that of facilitator, and all but two principals see their role as initiator in the change process. Also, more than one-third of the principals perceived that consulting, planning and evaluating change are not part of their role.

The strategy or approach listed by principals to bring about change varied from person to person, but nearly all cited the need to work with people. Some principals stressed working with all people seeking involvement (participation) and commitment on the part of the total staff while an equal number of principals stressed talking with "key" persons,

identifying majority positions and reaching consensus.

A second major area of agreement concerning change strategy derives from principals (7) who cited the use of a type of scientific/rational problem solving approach to change. Many of these same principals recognized the equal importance of people involvement strategies. As a result, it is impossible to separate the principals into people-based or process-based change strategy groups.

Most principals reported that they were selected for the job because of personal and professional qualifications. Most stated that they intend to remain on the job from one to five years unless asked to stay longer by those in authority.

The most common strength listed by principals is their ability to work with people. Communication and problem solving skills are next, and experience and ability to cope with stressful situations are the only other types of strengths to be mentioned more than once.

When the principals were asked what types of things "get to you" as a principal, more than two out of every three reported some aspect of teacher behavior, from apathy to non-professionalism. Unnecessary paper work and excessively short deadlines for paper work were the next most frequently mentioned stresses. Apathetic students and parents and red tape were mentioned by two principals.

With regard to the constraints upon their jobs, principals mentioned federal rulings concerning student rights, equal opportunity, ERA and Title IX, state and district directives and "red tape." Contract restrictions on meeting times with teachers were also mentioned frequently. The lack of resources in the form of personnel, facilities and money was the next most frequently mentioned constraint to the principal's job.

When asked with whom they shared problems as a matter of assistance, the principals indicated that they consulted with other educational officers, spouses, and close friends in that order.

Two-thirds of the principals indicated that more administrative help is needed to make their jobs more manageable. Related to this is the request to reduce "paper work." Additional factors to enhance the principal's manageability of the job are the freedom to select and deploy their own personnel, lowering of large school size and having more decision making power at the school level.

The principals seem to have definite ideas regarding the selection process of administrators, pre-service and in-service training of administrators. The principals feel that selection of administrators should be based on: (1) interpersonal relations skills, (2) persons who won't surrender to personal ambition, (3) persons who won't "surrender" to the good of the DOE bureaucracy and (4) persons who bring values from their home or background.

Although some background course work was suggested as a method of pre-service training, most of the pre-service training suggestions center around longer internship or on-the-job training (OJT). Skills suggested to be included in a pre-service training program was: (1) communication, (2) coping, (3) interpersonal competence, (4) school budgeting, (5) expenditure plan, (6) financial reporting, (7) curriculum planning, (8) transportation management, (9) community involvement, (10) teacher evaluation, and (11) negotiation skills for working with department/grade level chairpersons.

The in-service training suggestions advanced by the principals show very little agreement with regard to the need for in-service training.

There is concern about being away from school for training, so substitutes for the principal or summer training programs was recommended. The following kinds of in-service training activities were suggested.

1. Intervisitation
2. Accreditation visits
3. National conferences
4. Professional improvement leaves
5. Conduct complex principals problem solving groups
6. Inter-professional seminars between principals, lawyers, engineers, public administrators, etc.

The principals suggested that the in-service training program should fit an integrated long-term pattern rather than a series of "piecemeal" workshops. The specific content for in-service training suggested by the principals were: (1) budgeting, (2) management techniques, (3) mental health activities, (4) curriculum, (5) politics for principals, (6) planning, (7) time utilization, (8) personal development activities, (9) IPO training, (10) school law, (11) Araki's workshops, (12) Adachi's workshops, and (13) awareness training.

The principalship is considered by all but two principals as being an opportunity to exert leadership. There is also some concern that many constraints from outside the school such as federal, state, district directives were defracting from the opportunities for leadership.

The following suggestions for improving leadership opportunities were offered: (1) remove custodial tasks, (2) remove legislative pressures on principals, (3) place resource allocation powers at school level, (4) provide additional personnel and services at school level, (5) move more decision making to school level, (6) reduce paper work, (7) add flexibility and autonomy to principals' role, (8) have district set more specific outcomes for principals, and (9) have district personnel act as staff to schools.

The most commonly mentioned technique used by secondary principals to assess the pulse of the community was personal contact with community members with over half of the respondents citing this method. Assessment of the community through advisory council and PTSA meetings was used by over one-third of all principals.

A majority of the principals believe that the media has only a slight role in affecting their schools, while only one-fifth of all principals feel that the media played a large role. One-third of all principals mention that the media has had a negative effect on their school; only one of fifteen mentioned that media has had a positive potential. It was mentioned that media could be used as a positive force, but that to do so the principal has to act rather than react in potential media situations.

V. Comparative Analysis of the Results

This section discusses major findings about the principals' perceptions of the dynamics of the principalship in the secondary public schools in Hawaii. Although self-perceptions may be suspect with regard to objectivity in certain quarters, valuable trends and tendencies may be recognized. In addition, where feasible, comparisons will be made with high school principals on the mainland. A random sample survey of 1600 senior high school principals was conducted in 1977 by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. This survey permits generalizations about the entire United States, including Hawaii, although Hawaii did not fall within the national sampling schema. Technically speaking, Hawaii's random sampling of 15 senior high school principals from a possible 36 principals should reflect data which make the results more applicable to Hawaii than the national sample does to the nation.

Table 15 shows the distribution of principals by sex nationally (1977) and in Hawaii (1978).

Table 15

Distribution of the Percentage of Principals by Sex in the National Sample in 1977 and the Hawaii Sample in 1978

Sex	National Sample (1977) (%)	Hawaii Sample (1978) (%)
Female	7	16
Male	93	84

Table 15 shows that in Hawaii more females are secondary school principals proportionally than the national sample. The national sample is surprising given the national emphasis on women's rights and equal employment opportunity. Compared with the national sample, there are proportionally more than twice as many female secondary principals in Hawaii than on the mainland.

All married and 84 percent male, Hawaii's principals are highly educated with more than 60 percent of the principals possessing advanced degrees beyond the bachelors degree. The national sample shows 97 percent of the secondary principals possessing degrees beyond the bachelors. Hawaii's secondary principals appear to have significantly fewer advanced degrees than the national sample.

Hawaii's secondary public school principals possess an average school administrative experience of 13.5 years. This is slightly higher than the national survey which reported between 8 and 9 years. These facts tend to indicate that in Hawaii people remain principals for an extended period of time and that holding a particular principalship for an extended period of time was the career pattern. This fact should not be construed to mean that secondary principals will continue to be principals at the secondary level. Recent secondary principal personnel actions show that there seems to be an exodus of the secondary principals into elementary principalships. Nonetheless, the statistics being discussed point to the fact that principals in Hawaii remain as principals generally throughout their careers, either at the secondary or elementary principalship levels.

Hawaii's secondary principals are active in professional participation. Like their mainland counterparts, the principals participate more with local or state colleagues than with national groups. In case of Hawaii's

principals, national participation seemed difficult due to geographic considerations.

The amount of administrative assistance available to principals can be a crucial factor to success in their jobs. As previously stated, exactly half of the sampled principals in Hawaii feel that the amount of help provided by their administrative staff is adequate. However, half feel that their administrative help was inadequate. The national study indicates that one out of every six schools (16 percent) has five or more full-time administrative assistants, and 27 percent has four or more full-time assistants. This indicates that nearly half (43 percent) of the principals had four or more full-time administrative assistants. Hawaii's estimated average full-time equivalent administrative staff for secondary schools is approximately 2.8. It appears that Hawaii principals have a significantly smaller pool of administrative assistants than do their mainland counterparts. This lack of administrative staff (full-time) seems to be a major concern of secondary principals in Hawaii.

Similar to the national sampling, Hawaii's secondary principals spend most of their administrative time on school management. This may have some implication as to the primary role of the principal in school. Although both Hawaii and national principals feel that most of their time should be spent on program (curricula) development, responsibilities like (1) student behavior, (2) district office matters and (3) community relations seem to overwhelm the principal. This factor appears to point to the fact that the principal as a curriculum leader, which is being proposed in many quarters, may be unrealistic or that current principals lack the time and necessary skills to perform this role.

The survey team asked the secondary principals to identify the

"roadblocks" which make the job more difficult than it should be. The lack of administrative support, which includes both professional and clerical support, is emphasized by most principals in Hawaii. Nationally, principals believe that the greatest obstacle or "roadblock" in the achievement of their job objectives is: (1) time taken up by administrative details, (2) lack of time, and (3) variation in the ability of teachers. In general, principals nationally, like their counterparts in Hawaii, feel that, in order to assist schools in realizing an effective educational program, they must be given more freedom from administrative detail (district and state) and trivia.

The next group of "concerns" for both national and Hawaii secondary principals was the lack of managerial flexibility and the lack of time to meet (plan) and problem-solve with the staff. In this light, the strategy listed by Hawaii's principals to bring about change was the need to work with people. Most principals of Hawaii start by working with all people and seeking involvement (participation) and commitment on the part of the total staff.

The most common strength listed by Hawaii's principals is their ability to work with people. Communication and problem solving skills are listed next, and experience and ability to cope with stressful situations are also mentioned frequently.

Student, teacher, and parent apathy seems to "get to principals" more than any other educational situations. Unnecessary "paper work" also ranks high in adding to the frustration experienced by principals.

Hawaii's secondary principals feel that the constraints of their job fall into the following categories. First, the federal rulings concerning student rights, equal opportunity, ERA and Title IX; secondly, state and

district directives, with accompanying "red tape;" thirdly, union restriction on meeting times with teachers and faculty as well as the lack of personnel resources, facilities and monies.

A majority of Hawaii's secondary principals feel that more administrative help of some kind is needed to make their jobs manageable. Concomitantly, the freedom to select and deploy their own personnel, the lowering of large school size and having more decision-making powers at the school level were consistently stressed.

VI. Suggestions

As a result of this survey, it is possible to advance several suggestions which may prove helpful in the future to all personnel who are concerned with the operations of the Hawaii State Department of Education.

The following suggestions may be appropriate for close examination by individual principals and the principals' organization.

1. The administrative support required to maintain a positive student environment, do the paper work in compliance with federal, state and DOE rules and regulations, and provide technical support to teachers and students should be strengthened. A support system which is flexible and related to the scope of administrative problems within each school should be expanded by the Department of Education.
2. There is considerable discrepancy between the tasks the principal reports consume his time and those he believes he should be doing. The current role expectation of the secondary principal should be reassessed and classified to ensure a realistic role which will eventually enhance the secondary principal to become a perceived leader of a complex, dynamic, and sophisticated institution by the entire educational community.
3. Secondary principals appear to be concerned about the quality of their staff, both certificated and classified. Allowing the principal greater latitude and involvement in staffing may allow them to develop a more cohesive staff that is well suited to meet the needs of the students.

4. The Department of Education should conduct a thorough "administrative/managerial/clerical audit" to determine the optimum type and amount of administrative/clerical support work necessary to operate a secondary school effectively and efficiently.
5. In relation to suggestion #3, it may be profitable for the Department of Education to examine non-traditional administrative staff positions as a way of successfully coping with the growing complexities of the secondary school's administrative requirements.
6. The school-community relations aspect of the principal's role should be reassessed and provisions made to enhance its development.
7. An in-service training program which may include job rotation between state, district, and school level administrators, with an emphasis on developing career options and on incentives for remaining in the secondary principal's position should be explored. Elements may include more frequent sabbatical leaves and in-service efforts to promote professional growth.
8. The Department of Education may wish to analyze the decision making capabilities of the principal with regard to curriculum, personnel and student behavior. Their analysis may demonstrate the need for a highly individualized in-service training program for secondary principals.
9. Innovative approaches to the problem of developing a "sense of community" or "positive climate" in the schools should

be explored, and certain models should be field tested with proper evaluation techniques.

10. External influences and forces are likely to become greater and more sophisticated in the years to come. Each principal should be encouraged, supported and educated to deal with the various external influences and forces which will affect the school environment. A few of the external forces which will confront principals in the future and with which they must deal successfully include (1) the various media of communication, (2) legal aspects of education, (3) socio-political groups, and (4) related community factors.

APPENDIX 1

_____ Number Date _____

A STUDY OF THE SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALSHIP

SURVEY AND INTERVIEW GUIDE

Principals

Code: For each of the questions or statements with an S in the left margin, you should make your response prior to the interview. The item marked I, you will be asked for a verbal response during the interview.

DATA SHEET 1: PRINCIPAL-SCHOOL INFORMATION

_____ _____
Name of Principal High School

Current Family Status: Married _____ Unmarried _____

Number of Years in Current Job: _____

DATA FOR YOUR SCHOOL

(S) Current Enrollment _____

(S) No. of Teachers, Full Time: _____ No. of Teachers, Part Time: _____

(S) No. of Counselors, Full Time: _____ No. of Counselors, Part Time: _____

(S) Number of Administrative Staff, full time equivalency: _____
(Asst. Principals, Deans, Activity Directors, etc.)

(S) How adequate is the amount of help provided you by the administrative staff? (Check One)

Completely adequate _____
Usually adequate _____
Somewhat inadequate _____
Completely inadequate _____

(S) Number of department or area chairperson with at least one period of released time per day for chairpersonship: _____

(S) How adequate is the amount of help provided you via department or area chairperson? (Check One)

Completely adequate _____
Usually adequate _____
Somewhat inadequate _____
Completely inadequate _____

(S) Types of Programs by approximate percentage of student body (must add to 100%). (List percentage)

		Comments
College Prep	_____%	
Vocational/Business	_____%	
General	_____%	
Other (specify)	_____%	

(S) What percentages of your junior and senior classes are in these kinds of community experience programs:

Work Study	_____%	Alternative programs	_____%
Released time	_____%	Other (Specify)	_____%
Community service	_____%		

DATA SHEET 2: PRINCIPAL-PERSONAL INFORMATION

Education

(S) Degree	Institution	Date Completed (yr)	Major Field
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

(S) Other voluntary formal training totaling at least 3 days per program (since January 1975)	Duration (weeks)	Offered by: (NASSP, state, college, etc.)
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

(S) Activities or Athletics in college: _____

_____

(S) Honors or Wards in College: _____

_____

(S) Non Educational Honors, Awards, Activities: _____

_____

_____

_____

Teaching Experience

(S) School	Place	School Enrollment (Approx.)	School Year

School Administrative Experience

(S) School	Place	Title	School Year

Non-school Work Experience (since Bachelor's Degree), full time only, including military

(S) Type of Work	Employer	Months

Professional Memberships

(S) Organization	How Active Are You? Very	Mod.	Not	How Useful Is Membership? Very	Mod.	Not	Why?
NASSP	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
State Pr. Assn.	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
ASCD	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
Phi Delta Kappa	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
Union	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
_____	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____

Professional Activity

(S) What professional activities have you been involved with since January 1975 (speaking, teaching, writing, etc.)?

_____

_____

_____

Memberships in Community Organizations (Church, Civic, etc.)

(S) List organizations to which you formally belong and check where appropriate:

Organization	Active	Inactive	Professional Useful
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

DATA SHEET 3: JOB

(S) 1. What is the length of your work year? 10 months _____, 11 months _____.

Other (explain) _____

(S) 2. What are your typical school hours; i.e., on a typical school day, when do you arrive at your office and when do you leave the office for home?

Arrive at school _____ Leave school for home _____

(S) 3. Over the past two weeks, did you schedule time on your calendar for certain tasks? Listed below are ten functional areas. Indicate the number of hours (if any) that you prescheduled yourself into each of the nine functional areas listed below:

Area of Activity	Hours Prescheduled (planned)	Estimate of Hours Actually Spent
Program development (curriculum, instructional leadership)	_____	_____
Personnel (evaluation, advising, conferencing, recruiting)	_____	_____
School management (weekly calendar, office, budget, correspondence, memos, etc.)	_____	_____
Student activities (meetings, supervision, planning)	_____	_____
Student behavior (discipline, attendance, meetings)	_____	_____
Community (PTA, advisory groups, parent conferences)	_____	_____
District office (meetings, task forces, reports, etc.)	_____	_____
Professional development (reading, conferences, etc.)	_____	_____
Planning (annual, long range)	_____	_____
Time unscheduled (to accommodate walk-in emergencies)	_____	_____

If scheduled time is taken for other things, what typically causes the interruptions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(S) 4. With whom do you typically work in long-range planning for your school? (Check as applicable)

	Much Assistance	Some Assistance	No Assistance
My own admin. assistants			
District office administrators			
District office curr. specialists			
State office administrators			
State office curr. specialists			
Teacher committees			
Dept. or div. chairpersons			
Students			
Parents			
Other (Specify) _____			
_____			

(S) 5. How do you spend your time during the work year? Rank the nine functional areas according to the amounts of time spent in each area. (No. 1 signifies greatest amount of time, No. 9 signifies least amount of time.)

Also rank the areas according to how you feel that you should spend your professional time (would like to spend the time).

DO Spend Time	Area of Activity	SHOULD Spend Time
	Program Development	
	Personnel	
	School Management	
	Student Activities	
	Student Behavior	
	Community	
	District Office	
	Professional Development	
	Planning	

(S) 6. What factors determine this distribution of time?

_____

_____

_____

(S) 7. In a typical week, how many nights are you away from home for at least an hour on school-connected business?

_____ Nights How many last week? _____

What typically is the nature of these meetings or events?

(S) 8. Do you do school-related work on weekends? If so, what are the most typical tasks? (List)

_____

_____

(S) 9. What factors or people determine what it is you are going to do on a typical day? Rank order the influence of each factor. (1 = most influence, 5 or 6 least influence)

_____ I plan in advance.

_____ Things just come up.

_____ Inbasket.

_____ Weekly cycle of responsibilities.

_____ Supervisor assigns tasks.

_____ Other _____

(S) 10. When and how do you plan for what you are going to do the following week?

Time of Planning _____

Process of Planning _____

(S) 11. Identify in order of importance three road blocks that make your job more difficult than it should be.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

(S) 12. Identify in order of importance three aspects of the job situation which enable you to be effective as a principal.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

(S) 13. Do you think any of your time is wasted as a principal? List two most important waste of time.

1. _____

2. _____

(S) What suggestions would you give other principals for coping with the problems of not enough time?

(S) 15. Do you negotiate with the central office on your own or your staff's working conditions and salary? What role do you play?

DATA SHEET 4: TASKS

A. Students

(S) 1. How frequently do you meet with school leaders? (Check One)

_____ Daily _____ Weekly _____ Monthly
_____ Twice Weekly _____ Biweekly

(S) 2. With what student leaders do you meet at least once per month? (Check Where Applicable)

_____ Cabinet members
_____ Class officers or student council officers
_____ Special Advisory Groups
_____ Informal leaders
_____ Club leaders
_____ Others (specify) _____

(S) 3. What was the typical content of such meetings in recent months? (Check Where Applicable)

_____ Activities, projects
_____ School rules
_____ Curriculum
_____ Student-teacher relations
_____ Other (specify) _____
_____ Student discipline
_____ Student-community problems
_____ Teaching quality
_____ Student-student relations

(I) 4. When you wish to influence student behavior in positive directions what initiatives do you take? (if any)

(I) 5. What role do you play in implementing these initiatives?

(I) 6. What would you say are the main school-connected concerns of your students?

(I) 7. What would you say are the main non-school concerns of your students?

(I) 8. How do you keep informed about what your students are thinking concerning school or about life in general?

(I) 9. What do you see as your primary role with regard to students?

(I) 10. How would you like (hope) to be perceived by students in your role as principal?

(I) 11. What do you think should be your school's major contributions to the lives of your students?

B. Community/Parents

(S) 1. With what parent groups do you meet regularly or frequently? (Check Where Applicable)

	Group	Frequency (e.g., 2 x per month)
_____	PTA/Parent Organization	_____
_____	PTA Executive Committee	_____
_____	Parent task forces	_____
_____	Parent Advisory Groups	_____
_____	Boosters Club	_____
_____	Voc/Spec. Ed. Advisory	_____
_____	Other (specify) _____	_____
_____	Other (specify) _____	_____

(I) 2. Over the past several months, what have been the main concerns of parents' groups with whom you have met?

_____

_____

(I) 3. Over the past several months, with what community groups or agencies have you had significant contact?

_____

_____

(I) 4. What was the nature of these contacts (#3 above)? _____

_____

(I) 5. Do community persons or organizations participate in curriculum planning for your school?

Yes _____; No _____. If so describe the process.

(I) 6. In what other ways do community organizations or agencies influence your school? With what community groups do you typically meet?

(S) 7. In what areas have you involved parents or other citizens in the school? (Check where applicable)

_____ Set objectives, priorities
_____ Evaluation
_____ Finance
_____ Student Rights/Resp.
_____ Resource persons
_____ Aides
_____ Curriculum advisory
_____ Personnel criteria/selection
_____ Problem finding/problem solving
_____ Other _____

(S) 8. Have you taken initiative over the past three years to increase parent/citizen participation? Explain.

(I) 9. What methods do you employ for communicating school program and school organization concerns to parents and the general community. (This is intended to exclude communication about specific students.)

(I) 10. What methods do you employ for communicating school program and school organization concerns to faculty members?

C. Staff

(S) 1. With what staff groups do you meet regularly or frequently? (Check where applicable)

Group	Frequency (e.g., 1 hr per wk)
_____ Faculty as a whole	_____
_____ Department chairpersons	_____
_____ Cabinet/Senate	_____
_____ Curriculum council	_____
_____ Secretaries, clerks	_____
_____ Special task forces	_____
_____ Other (Specify) _____	_____

C. Staff

2. What are the main issues/concerns of the teachers in this high school? (Rate: A = Most Significant, B = Somewhat Significant, C = Relatively Significant)

_____ salaries
_____ student behavior
_____ class size
_____ insufficient time
_____ lack of public support
_____ others (specify)
_____

_____ staff evaluation
_____ insufficient clerical help
_____ inadequate instructional materials
_____ ineffective administration
_____ student grading and reporting

(I) 3. What causes good school morale/good school climate? What part do you play in this?

(S) 4. What specific initiates, if any, have you taken the last three years to provide or improve faculty inservice education?

(S) 5. What do you see as the advantages and disadvantages of administering a school with a master contract (negotiated agreement)?

(S) 6. How would you characterize the faculty's influence in the decision-making process in this high school? (Check appropriate point)

1	2	3	4	5
not at all influential		somewhat influential		highly influential

(S) 7. How much involved are you in the process of negotiations (consultation, bargaining) with teachers? (Check appropriate point)

1	2	3	4	5
no involvement		some involvement		high involvement

(S) 8. How do you think your teachers perceive you with regard to their position in negotiations? (Check appropriate point)

1	2	3	4	5
not supportive		somewhat supportive		highly supportive

(S) 9. How effective do you regard yourself to be in the area of staff relations? (Check appropriate point)

1	.	2	.	3	.	4	.	5
highly ineffective				somewhat effective				highly effective

(I) 10. What is the appropriate number of grievances filed from your school in the past school year?

Number: _____

D. Curriculum/Programs

(S) 1. We are interested in the ways that curriculum is developed in your school (participants and processes). Please give us an example of a new program developed recently. (Check where appropriate)

Participant	Describe Role	List Process or Activities (summarize)
_____ Central Office	_____	
_____ High School Staff	_____	
_____ Departments	_____	
_____ Curr. Committees	_____	
_____ Students	_____	
_____ Parents	_____	
_____ Community Groups	_____	
_____ Consultants	_____	
_____ Others (specify)	_____	

(S) 2. What process do you use in planning major projects and programs? (Check where applicable)

_____ Recognizing the occasion
_____ Establishing needs
_____ Defining goals/objectives
_____ Organizing
_____ Other (Specify)_____
_____ Providing for resource
_____ Providing for evaluation
_____ Providing for training
_____ Securing allegiances

(S) 3. What is your role in curriculum development? Describe)

(S) 4. What professional resources do you normally rely upon for curriculum/ program improvement? (consultants, periodicals, etc.)

(S) 5. By whom are curricular changes normally initiated? (Check where applicable)

_____ individual teachers
_____ departments
_____ students & parents
_____ other (specify)_____

_____ district administration
_____ state administration
_____ building administration

(I) 6. What do you consider to be the major strengths of this high school with regard to its curriculum/programs?

(I) 7. What do you consider to be the major weaknesses of this high school with regard to its curriculum/programs?

(I) 8. How do you anticipate curriculum needs from year to year? How do you organize resources to meet those needs?

(I) 9. How effective do you regard yourself to be in the area of curriculum development?

1	.	2	.	3	.	4	.	5
ineffective				somewhat effective				highly effective

Explain.

(I) 10. What is your role, if any, in the development of extracurricular activities?

E. Program Evaluation

(I) 1. How do you evaluate the outcomes of programs or projects initiated by you?

(S) 2. Other than the evaluation that is required by others (such as the central administration, the state department of education, or accreditation groups), are special efforts made to evaluate all programs in this high school on a regular basis?

Yes _____ No _____

(S) 3. Who is significantly involved in evaluating programs in this school? (Check where applicable)

_____ Central office personnel
_____ High school administrators
_____ Teachers
_____ Students
_____ Parents
_____ Others (specify)
_____

(S) 4. How effective do you regard yourself to be in the area of program evaluation? (Check appropriate point)

1	.	2	.	3	.	4	.	5
highly ineffective				somewhat effective				highly effective

(S) 5. What outside resources do you use to assist with planning? (List)

_____

_____

_____

_____

DATA SHEET 5: PROBLEM-SOLVING AND PROBLEM ATTACK

All high school principals, sooner or later, have to deal with difficult problems.

(I) 1. Can you name a problem that happened since September 1978 that you feel you handled well?

How did it arise? (What events occurred?)

What did you do?

How did the problem get resolved?

(Ask for description of second problem--one should be "internal" with students or staff, one should be "external" with community, district office or media.)

(I) 2. Can you name a problem that happened since September 1978 that you feel you did not handle well?

How did it arise? (What occurred?)

What did you do?

How did the problem get resolved?

(S) 3. How effective do you regard yourself in the area of problem solving? (Check appropriate point)

1	.	2	.	3	.	4	.	5
highly ineffective				somewhat effective				highly effective

(S) 4. What do you consider the most important components of problem resolution? (List)

_____

_____

(I) 5. How do you determine when to make a decision? _____

_____

(S) 6. Identify a change that has been imposed upon you or your school. Explain the source of the requirements to change and your actions in response to the requirements. (Describe)

DATA SHEET 6: CHANGE

(S) 1. Name any major changes which occurred in your school during the past year in which you played a major role.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

(S) 2. Where did the idea for one of the above changes originate? No._____ (Check where appropriate)

_____ staff
_____ students
_____ patrons
_____ others (Specify) _____
_____ central administration
_____ advisory group
_____ principal

(I) 3. Was there a source of resistance? Yes ____ No _____ (Describe)

(S) 4. What is your typical role in the changes that occur in the high school? (Check where applicable)

_____ initiator
_____ planner
_____ consultant
_____ facilitator
_____ evaluator
_____ others (specify) _____

(I) 5. Do you have a particular strategy or approach that you typically are to bring about change?

_____ Yes _____; No _____. If so, please describe it.

DATA SHEET 7: PERSONAL/PROFESSIONAL

(I) 1. Why do you think you were selected for this job?

(S) 2. How long do you intend to remain in this high school? (Check where applicable)

_____ As long as the district will permit
_____ Not more than a year or two
_____ Three to five years
_____ Six to ten years
_____ Other (specify) _____

(I) 3. If you were not in your present job, what job would you prefer to be in?

(I) 4. What do you consider to be your major strengths or assets in handling this job?

(I) 5. What do you consider to be your limitations in handling this job?

(I) 6. What things tend to bother you or "get to" you as principal?

(I) 7. How do you deal with stress?

(I) 8. What are the main institutional (school) and social (society constraints) on your job and on secondary education?

(I) 9. With whom do you find it helpful and rewarding to share your professional problems?

(I) 10. Speculate about the high school principalship in general. What is needed to make the job more manageable and effective?

(I) 11. What suggestions do you have for improving the preservice training of principals?

(I) 12. What suggestions do you have for improving the inservice training of principals?

(I) 13. Are you satisfied that the principalship today offers you a good opportunity for leadership? (Explain)

How might the principalship become a more effective leadership position?

DATA SHEET 8: FUTURE

(S) 1. The following are conditions either within schools or in society that are likely to have significant influence upon you and your school during the next three to five years. Rate the following conditions as being most significant (A), somewhat significant (B), or relatively insignificant (C). This is a forced choice question, so rate at least six questions "A", six questions "B", and six questions "C." Add and rate any other conditions you feel are significant.

_____ Enrollment changes
_____ Students' nonattendance
_____ Alternative schools, program
_____ Demands for basics
_____ Declining achievement
_____ Compulsory education
_____ Community-based learning
_____ National youth service
_____ Desegregation
_____ Other (specify) _____

_____ Finance & general economy
_____ Drug use
_____ Accountability
_____ New technology
_____ Community participation
_____ Staff competency
_____ Competency testing
_____ Graduation requirements
_____ Violence in schools

(I) 2. What is likely to be the effect on youth and on schools? (each one named)

(S) 3. Where do you get most of the information that influences your predictions about the future of high schools such as this one? (Check where applicable)

_____ present events
_____ school district projections/ studies
_____ discussions with knowledgeable people
_____ professional literature
_____ popular literature
_____ others (specify) _____

(I) 4. What techniques do you use to assess the pulse of your community concerning community/school relations?

(I) 5. What role does the media play (if any) in changing your school?

(S) 6. In the future, what will the principal most need in order to succeed? Rank the following items from 1 to 10 or from 1 to 10 + "n" if you add "n" items.

_____ inservice on new problems
_____ experience
_____ school reorganization
_____ additional administrative help
_____ responsible parents
_____ strong union
_____ other (explain) _____
_____ better student attitudes
_____ good state & national leadership
_____ strong local leadership
_____ stronger professional organization